

Thursday, December 27, 12
11:22 AM
Dream-Book

The Dreamⁱ

The Book

Twin themes: **Doomsday, and Secrecy**

As I said in draft of testimony to Congress [q.v.]: This secrecy threatens the survival of our species.

Bring out what is missing from my essay on Secrecy, Identity and National Security:

What is it that is kept secret?

Why?

From whom?

Secrecy and nucs

At each point, bring out how secretly this was kept. (e.g., NESC 2009; JSCP; delegation; (effectively, real operations: two-man rule... CANDOR; fall-out; fission and fusion ("Keep them confused": Ike) (Norman Solomon's book!); first-strike character of SIOP; cities on target system (Robert Kerry tries unsuccessfully to get at these).

And ask: Why was this secret? From whom? Why so long?

Look at McNamara's lies about Cuba-II: invasion plans, Mongoose (assassination plans for Castro—and see Diem, EGLJ; Guantanamo, in Cuba-I and II; de Soto;

Applies to Soviets, too. Tac nucs and warheads on Cuba; delegation; SAM not fired by Khrushchev; AA not controlled by SU; **small number of ICBMs** (hence? Fear of Open Skies, U-2

[Note: Ike was willing to see JFK elected rather than reveal overhead recon, or results of it! According to Eugene Jarecki, Ike revealed this to JFK during campaign, told him no missile gap. ^{see} He was furious at MIC making this an issue (see the one guy who resigned, claiming there was a missile gap: Trevor...); and probably, for frustrating his desire for a test ban. (But see earlier SU offers, which he ignored). Just as LBJ was willing to see Nixon elected, rather than reveal his wiretapping of Nixon's campaign and GVN (or was this just an excuse? Issue with Stone/Kuznick)

Handwritten signature

Why was the size of our stockpile a secret even from hst? (? Certainly, others). For same reason as SU secrecy: so small?

(Note the early focus of the Atomic Scientists: to keep control of nuclear weapons in civilian hands; Truman, too. Total failure, under Ike. And was military involved even earlier in the AEC itself? Or was that a later decision?)

After the Manhattan Project, still a maintenance of total secrecy (which was logical, during the war, to avoid stimulating a German project). "To keep The Secret of the Bomb from the Russians." Even though the scientists tried over and over to press the point, "There is no secret!" (What was secret, necessarily, was the fact that there was a crash project: i.e., that the Americans believed it could be achieved before the end of the war (if the war could be kept going long enough, at least in the Pacific! Planned for Japan from early, 1943: not known to MP scientists; Makhijani.)

"There is no secret": meaning, the Soviets, and any other industrial nation, can do this, in a few years from starting to try. Hst believed that there were "industrial" secrets of technique, which the Soviets could not master. (Did any scientists believe this?) Groves believed we could get a monopoly of uranium: not aware (?) of deposits in East Germany (Herken): and elsewhere?

I.e., we **can't** and won't have a monopoly of the Bomb, longer than a few years. (or of H. Note first tests by UK, France; and H-bombs by them). But hst and others tempted by the notion of (a monopoly of) "the master card." (Like "the ring" of Tolkien. World domination.)

Specific hope for East Europe, Poland. It had no effect whatever. (Can't be used, especially by a democracy, in the form Churchill envisioned: "Do this, do that...or else!" (Hst claimed to have used it thus over northern Iran in 1946.)

[note, this morning: WWII left the world with four "unnaturally" divided states (between East and West, Soviets and capitalists): North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam (in 1954; to some extent, in 1945-46); China and Taiwan; East and West Germany.

In every one of these, the split was maintained by the threat of nuclear weapons; in Germany, it was maintained by nuclear threats *on both sides*.

In the first three, they were in the neighborhood of the SU or China (Korea, both). The nuclear threats were from the US side.

Germany was in the neighborhood of both the SU satellites (with SU troops in east Germany) and the West (Europe: with US troops in West Germany, both as a tripwire and to keep the Germans from being tempted to achieve, or achieving, independent nuclear weapons, or from intervening in East Germany).

Why did the Soviets need MRBMs, IRBMs and bombers trained on Germany? NOT for fear of a deliberate invasion by NATO (or Germany, or the US). But because of a real risk of an uprising on the Soviet-controlled side. (NOT a risk in North Vietnam, North Korea, or China! In both China and Vietnam, as in Yugoslavia, the Communist regime had the prestige of having fought foreign occupiers in WWII (and in Vietnam, afterwards). (True in Indonesia, too? Largest CP outside China and SU).

In case of an uprising in East Germany or East Berlin (possibly, elsewhere) West Germany would have been tempted to intervene, especially if the East German troops had left the Warsaw Pact and joined the uprising. That NATO entry (possibly in the context of large military conflict in East Germany) had to be deterred, and if necessary, stopped. (And intervention in Hungary and Poland deterred: as it was).

So: both SU divisions, and nuclear weapons (even deployed to East Germany, secretly). (Neither side wanted **any** Germans—their own side, or the other—to have independent control of nuclear weapons: though the US came close to this, as Khrushchev feared. His threats did not work, vs. US.)

a potential "answer" to problem of

By contrast, what seemed to me a "genuine" secret, of US vulnerability—EMP, blackout, the Cristofelos (?) effect (ask Rubel)—was in the NYT that same fall (get: fall, 1958?)

*1) navigation
flight
2) avoiding
intervention
of weapons*

Secrecy: see the current classification of the Senate Select committee on Intelligence report on Interrogation and Detention. It needs to be leaked; or released in (near-) full. And soon, now, to counteract effects on public and policy of Zero Dark Thirty.

As for that film: Exactly what access were they given? FOIA. What were they told about the effects of torture, and by whom? Were the final results reviewed by the Pentagon, CIA? WH? Did anyone criticize the impression of the role of torture? (Note: the word "torture" is not used in the film, is it?) Who did **not criticize** that, after seeing it?

Durbin?

Note objections by two senators—Wyden, (? Durkin?)—on the NSA interpretation of the law, and its actual surveillance. They say, wrongly classified; but they don't put it out. Like: role of Saudis in 9-11 (still "classified": despite Sen. Graham's objection).

Note secrecy of both torture program, and NSA surveillance (COG? Suspension of the Constitution). **Secrecy of classified annexes to Emergency regulations, and Continuity of Government (COB):**

(Film: "torturers were doing what had to be done; at least, what seemed as though it might help (get links established between Iraq and 9-11!), but also, to get to Al Qaeda: OK, that's understandable, even justified: except that the disadvantages of

doing this, and its immorality (a high bar, for justification) were argued strongly by some agencies: this omitted in film; and the film falsely states—it does not merely allow this interpretation, by omission—that information received was crucial, thereby retroactively justified, and justified for the future, even “compelled.”) (No Establishment figure, or president, would say: “This wasn’t justified even to get Bin Laden; this end did **not** justify this means, and nothing would.”)

Bradley Manning’s revealed secret: that Obama was still turning over prisoners to be tortured by the Iraqis, against US and international law. And cover-up. (And what about `Bagram, today?)

Note that this criminality revealed by BM was “only Secret”! (I wouldn’t have expected that!) Is this because it’s become so routine, that it doesn’t have to be TS or SCI?! They aren’t worried about breaking this law?

Isn’t some prosecutor (US DA, or foreign) willing to test in court whether: “If the president says Do it—or if the OLC says it’s legal—it’s legal”? Isn’t that necessary, to get our Constitution back? (And the Magna Carta! “Restore the Magna Carta”!)

Thus: raise ^{the on issue,} the legitimacy of the secrecy system: wrt torture, surveillance, nuclear policy.

Dr. Strangelove Syndrome: secrets kept from one’s own public and the world are also kept from the adversary: even when, for deterrence, it was essential that they **not** be secret from the adversary:

C-II, SU tac nucs and delegation; US delegation; NATO effective possession (lack of real locks); Doomsday Machines; Dead Hand in SU; LOW in US;

Secrecy on nuclear policy and especially on nuclear winter and the Doomsday Machine (even prior to nuc winter discovery) is **as if climate change/catastrophe were all classified. As wicked as that!**

Yet, one must say, that climate change is not classified, not even secret: yet there is no real response to it: thanks to manufacture of doubt (as for nuclear winter: same people; and same people, doubt on tobacco and cancer, comparably wicked to keep secret—as the tobacco companies did do for decades) by and for coal and oil companies. Equivalent to MIC. Propaganda for the necessity for deterrence, for necessity for damage-limiting (like clean coal: infeasible); arms control and end of Cold War; need for “superiority” (or, in SU, for “parity,” superiority where possible);

So—no guarantee, even high assurance, that revelation, lack of secrecy, would make a big difference (in face of propaganda and a campaign of...ignoring my book, debate, facts, anti-investigation by Congress or media...)

Other analogies, where secrecy was lethal, and WB (whistle-blowing) was essential: tobacco; asbestos; Vioxx; Catholic priests' rape of children;

Thus, need for corporate whistleblowing, and denial of total secrecy. See the S&L scandals; Enron, et al; sub-prime mortgages and the financial melt-down. Why not more whistleblowers (even though not a classification system!) How many were there? (see Michael Lewis). Why not more? Regulatory systems failure (none in nuclear area). Congressional failures of investigation. (Compare: use of steroids in athletes!)

Silence of the doves! Warnke could have been WB. McNamara could have been WB at the time. He was, later, but without documents (like Gen. Butler). See his chapter on C-II in *In Retrospect*: ignored by reviewers. McGeorge Bundy memoirs: systematically plays down risks.

(My) claims on first-use ignored or deprecated by historians. See Betts on revelations by Truman and Nixon (Time, 1975).

Difficulty getting my statements on delegation into the press, or Congress.

See C.P. Snow on the tendency of "a small group of men, acting in secret" to be carried away by "gadgets" (A-Bomb!); or by crazy ideas like "de-housing," ruthlessness.

See Snow on me (Esquire) and on possibility that Einstein would have protested, if he had known. (See Szilard to Einstein in 1945: he wasn't cleared for what Szilard wanted to tell Roosevelt. Rabinowitch on me. Rubel's reaction to SIOP-62)

On Secrecy:

Vs. "if you have nothing to hide, why worry about privacy, surveillance?"

(Nearly) **everyone can be blackmailed**: everyone has something they want to keep secret from someone. And if everything is transparent to the government (or a corporation: as in cookies, internet searches...), then everyone can be coerced or influenced, on the basis of knowledge of their private desires, fears, concerns...not known to everyone.

Must/should governments, and corporations, be totally transparent? (To public; the mission of hackers). "Not individuals." What of groups? Associations? Churches? Unions? And then: mobs; dope-rings; terrorists?

Vs. Aftergood: His premises, widely held: the problem is "too much secrecy, unnecessary secrecy, excessive secrecy"; and the problem with that is that "people won't respect the system; where everything is secret, nothing is secret (Potter Stewart: bah); the result is leaks" (!^WThe problem is leaks! Solution: keep secret only what "needs" to be secret: for national security?)

BUT: What those who manage the system feel a "need" above all to keep secrets from the public, from Congress, from political rivals, from bureaucratic rivals. And they **will** use the system for that—**no matter how "small" the number of things kept secret becomes, no matter how much "unnecessary" secrecy is eliminated.** (Moreover, what will later turn out to be "necessary" to keep secret—to avoid embarrassment, loss of jobs, even prosecution—is not always apparent at the time of recording it; so the safe thing is to keep, if not everything, much more secret than appears to require it at the time of classification).

*Revised by
95% —
you will
still need
WBs, have
too few
"good leaks"*

Thus, to Aftergood and others, leaking is a result and a sign of "over-classification": too much is classified "that doesn't deserve it, in terms of national security." Well, it's true that most of what is leaked "^{too many leaks} doesn't deserve classification," is wrongly classified in terms of the regulations, which focus on national security.

But it was classified for a reason, deliberately (and will be defended as a secret tenaciously). What is leaked is not "what needs neither secrecy nor public knowledge," which is the bulk of what appears to be "unnecessary secrecy". What is leaked **needs** public knowledge, and from the point of the bureaucrat, it needs secrecy.

Even though it does **not** affect national security (significantly: anything can be held to do so, hypothetically), it is deliberately classified because it may demonstrate (or point to) crimes, lies, errors, recklessness. (See Pentagon Papers; some didn't "need" secrecy at all; but anything in it pointed to existence of study, and thus to

evidence of lies and errors and recklessness. Bradley Manning on Iraq and Afghanistan: add, crimes (torture, bribery, assassinations).

(False lessons of Cuba-II, ^{now, a "secret"} **due to secrecy and lies on both sides**; JFK was tough, and that was what won for him. ^u (True: but he was reckless, much more than he knew, **even though he was willing**—eventually (which may have been too late, by a day)—to concede defeat, equality with SU. A later false lesson: his actual concession, of a secret trade, was the critical factor; no need to worry about his recklessness, he wasn't; there was little risk of nuclear war! Wrong!)

Nuclear matters: secrets of incredible recklessness, creation of Doomsday Machines, loose controls (as in Fukushima), secret threats and commitments.

Thus, however a system is reformed and regulated, **there will always be a need for whistle-blowers, willing to take large personal risks** (and for anonymous leakers, with reduced risks: Wikileaks)

[Other aspects of secrecy, [?] not to be explored? ^{At least mentioned & briefly described} Effect on Constitution? Gives rise to wars like VN, Iraq, Afghanistan. Covers Torture, violations of law and Constitution.

Yes, leaks can "embarrass" us in our relations to other nations. But the public does need to know, in some cases, just what is most embarrassing: that the USG secretly supports and allies with and even creates dictatorial and corrupt regimes, which our diplomats appraise realistically in their cables (Cablegate). We do **not** support democracy in the Third World, and we know it. And our problems arise largely because of who we support and what we do.

Yes, "diplomats are sent abroad to lie for their country." But how much of this should be kept secret from US Congress and public? For how long?

"Enemies" (How you do it) (mouth of the barrel) "Why do they hate us?" The real answers are secret, or obscured. The answer, "for our freedoms" is a deliberate, and effective, crucial, lie (it is not the motive of suicide bombers—fighting against occupiers—nor their leaders). This lie is meant to prevent the terrorists' goal of getting our public's attention for their grievances, their need for redress and/or for revenge. (Their goal may also be to increase the domestic costs of empire. But given our government's management of frame and opinions, it is more likely to backfire, to serve our imperial goals, to inure public to "paying any cost" to defend our "values" and public safety (while actually endangering both). ^{not to justify an "response"}

PROCESS:

1. On Soviets, and the relation to Secrecy:

Talk to Gorbachev, and Chernyaev. *Prefer G?*

Did "my team" know of the Doomsday nature of Soviet plans? (And nuc winter; and relation): Georgi Arbatov and Alexei Arbatov; Velikhov; Sagdeev (friend of Jurecki); Djurkhin; ~~Kernilev~~? *Sergei Prokhanov; (PR T*
Ask Chris Paine.

Any thought of leaks, then or now? Not only Gorbachev could have produced "nuclear glasnost"! Any Soviet or Russian generals?

Did the people above know of BW (Bio warfare: see Leitenberg and Hoffman, Dead Hand)?

2. Make ^{my} publication a test of the secrecy system. Show stuff that has been declassified, but only after appeal. (As well as stuff by me or MHH that has been refused on appeal). Why withheld so long? Why released so late? Why the struggle?

Have National Security Archive raise this issue.

3. Tell publishers: if they won't make this an issue, won't risk prosecution—which would be a big news story (their rejecting)—I will find another publisher, or self-publish.

4. I'm "the one" to do this! My past and present work—and image—relating to secrecy!

I've long wanted to do a book on secrecy; "after" the nuclear book! Together! (not the whole story on secrecy). How secrecy has been necessary for the nuclear policy, the creation of the Doomsday Machine!

FPF: I'm still whistle-blowing! And I call for others to do the same!

ADD FOR CONGRESS INVESTIGATION!

5. Risking—calling for—prosecution makes a dramatic story; and it may be the necessary key to getting attention for the issue. I challenge Congress to investigate; note Robert Kerry unsuccess. *See me at Rocky Flats (banister)*

(cf. Zollock)

(me to Powell at RG)

6. Tell Schrag the background to the trial! (My intro). And Gittlin. Others who should be interested: Michael Lewis; Bob Herbert; Kucinich; Markey (running for Senate); Tim Weiner and his wife Kate; Risen; Jeffrey Sterling; Kiriakou; Drake; Ritter; Jake; Rosenthal. Blanton; Burr; Lynn Eden; Scott Sagan; Daley; Schell; PSR.

7. Other countries should get into this issue.

UK-Trident: be the first NWS to give up nuclear weapons! (Show what one Trident can do: Roback?) Show UK movies at last! (On computers, at least!)

8. Talk to old hands. Rubel. Enthoven? Rowen? (no); Fred Kaplan; Herken; Trinkl;

9. Solomon; Robert; Tom Reifer;

10. Get everything scanned.

11. This may be the key to **breaking through the lack of interest in nuclear weapons** and war. Tie it to secrecy. (That is perhaps an issue today, literally, because of the torture debate around Zero Dark Thirty. And the Freedom of the Press Foundation: Wikileaks, Bradley Manning. That may be less true a year from now, or more.)

*Release/leak
Secrete
Study*

Still, the drama of my challenge to the Obama administration, to prosecute, or to defend their secrecy: that might do it. (I've long thought that; but what is new here is the thought that I might not only publish secret documents or passages, and even call attention to it, but I might **emphasize the role of the secrecy system in permitting the system to develop, endangering us and the world; how the secrets are kept (see gov treatment of my earlier revelations, on delegation, etc.; see absence from histories; delays in declassification, need for appeals; fifty years in the case of the Cuban Missile Crisis, one of the most studied episodes in history!**

12, Get a Stone movie, after all?! (If he's enjoying this process. Note his concern and revelations about nuclear policy, in series!)

Torantino?

END NOTES

ⁱ Dream: I'm in a bus in Manhattan; but I want to get to Bloomfield Hills (see my e-mail to Cusack about "Grosse Pointe Blank"), Cranbrook. Driver says he is going to Bloomfield Hills; down "Woodward".

But: we're in Manhattan. At a certain point, we seem to be heading directly into some pedestrians in the street (like chases in films); but bus goes **over** them; it's above the ground; it's floating along. I ask driver: Is this a [hover-craft]: does it move on air bursts to the ground? We go still higher: I realize, this must be a dream.

I explain to two young passengers how in my dreams I feel I can coast along the ground simply by raising my feet; I think others could do this, if they knew; I even go high, through mountains, above ocean... Again I say, I know this is a dream. Especially as we begin to pass desert regions, "just outside Manhattan." Impossible.

Earlier, we're above a large section beginning in Times Square and extending uptown; it's being constructed, with a layer of good wood (presumably over concrete): I'm told, "This is going to be a gated community, for businessmen." "In downtown Manhattan?!" Of course, the buildings are already for them; but this will be gated; "they won't have to mingle with ordinary people at all, not even on sidewalks, not getting into their limos. They'll become like a different race."

I ask, why aren't there more airborne buses like this on the road? We see others, on the pavements. Someone says: they can't rise as high as we are. The airway is still uncrowded. We're going 40mph (only), at 200 feet; but then we rise further.

Later, after being in I. Magnin's (mentioned in Ellis' bio), I show off my flying—up to the dome of the building. (I want to buy umbrella, it's raining outside; want a cheap one, but their line starts at \$1500. I want to see one of the those; it's a parasol, yellow and green, with tassels.)

One of the young men is playing a board game with himself: "Super-Go." I mention to both of them that the draft ended early 1972 (not sure: 1973? Actually, early 193), "that's fifty years ago...no, wait...40 years ago" (in dream, same mistake as in waking states).. "A generation of kids, boys—no, two generations—have grown up not concerned about the draft!"

(Or nuclear weapons: since...1963? Certainly, since 1980: 32 years ago!
Except for terrorists' nucs! I.e., NOT all-out general war.)

Patricia and I are in Patrice's apartment; I couldn't remember her name, for age reasons, embarrassing; she doesn't come out; a housekeeper comes out, with her two sons (one is a junior at Duke); she's with someone in the bedroom. We don't mind.

Five people from RAND have come to my house. Why? Perhaps to give an award? But I think: to fire me. They've looked at my in-and-out records, realized that I've been in the building only sporadically. I will explain: "I work at home." I was going to gather up my manuscript to show them; perhaps pad it.

Then I think: Wait—I'm not working there any more; I gave up my ID card; I haven't been getting paid. Even when I was there (hsr having hired me—I was just using it as an office; I had no clearance; I didn't interact with anyone; yet, I was walking the halls; How could I, without a clearance? People saw me, were surprised I was there (after PP), "He's still alive—still around?" Maybe hsr trusted me not to look at papers on people's desks in their offices, as I walked around.

[After this dream, I wake up with thought: Make the secrecy of nuclear matters a major theme of the book. Challenge the secrecy system, not just for publicity, **but because secrecy has been a major contributor to our nuclear danger, present as well as past; this secrecy must end.**

Over the years, I've mainly challenged secrecy publicly with respect to interventions, torture, civil liberties, unconstitutional practices: **not nuclears, one of the earliest and most consequential arenas of secrecy.**

1

Dinner AM Dec 27, 2012

✓ Book - Secrecy Tim Lamer -
Secrecy (the Secrecy) Torture:
Survival of our species.

✓ What is meant?

✓ Wf?

✓ (see NYT on BMD, Blankout!
BMD

✓ (see class. report on torture
CAT ed! vs. access given to
gov Dec 30

✓ What were they told - of course?

✓ Was criticized first?

✓ Who did not?

Dunkin?

✓ secrecy of NSA top - the interpretation
✓ Torture & BM - was no secret.
when BMD

✓ ("only secret!" It became common!
Not unusual about
making law

✓ Legitimacy of Wiki/BM's class - secrecy!
Torture! (still - i. frag
BAGRAM

✓ Does OLC/WH order "wiki it legal"?

What had Const. & Pres. someone (from OA) + that!

12-27-12

3.

✓ get enough copiers - scanned

✓ I'm the one, to do this!
and it's already by image - many, WB

✓ All Schrag (Kittling) (Kris; Kerkent; Tim Waver
with Kate
Scott Schrag Rixen, Abby Steady,
Pittler, John Rountree

✓ web? Oth countries - UK/Trident (be the first
to give up?)
show UK movies

particip. for money!

✓ (Dr. S - C-II, delegation, NATO

✓ I've always been drawn to being back?

✓ My essay, Nat. Sec., Identity
Doesn't go into: Why secret - why?
From who? What is hidden?
Kris Curing; D.M. no CF

✓ As of climate problem is unsecretly
classified?

✓ (as, evolution
tobacco
asbestos
Vegetables, etc.) } what difference? unsecretly
Michael Kris
How long? why not more?
in Cath. Church, points

12-27-12

2

✓ Survey of delegation

✓ SO, too! Karlovich — Chrysa —
old team

Don't they know?

✓ Panel: Anubator, Velickov, Lopden,
K Djinklin

Karlovich

BW, too? Q of th?
(Kaiterly, Kyriv, Stone)

✓

to be being fun?

✓ Break things "unintended" is news?

✓ (Middle of Manhattan: a gated community
(Pine Grove) for businessmen — at least now,
they're on individuals — stage brings him —
they'll be separate news...

✓ Best of class;

(shows stuff that has been declared —
after approval (withheld at first))

Why so late? Why tho?

Afterward / NAB's Archive

✓ Tell publisher — if they want — news
stop — I self-publish (as first another)

morning calls (People saw me - "He's still alive - still here")

[see Michael Newman, author, on RAND, SRI
+ visit from chairman - no beer coast + walk

around? By her turned me not to look at papers on desks.

[Call Merrill - send for election blog, letters)

[Safford's attitude on books

"(H) too much class - note is secret."

NO " " is " - lots is secret.

"People won't report secrets - they will leak"
there too many ~~secrets~~ leaks - "sign of new-class" NO - even of crime, errors... - PP bias

[WHO look because enough have secret -

"for secret reason." There will always be secrets that new looking, new WHO, even if only a small number of class/secrets.

Paris - "defects" (large)

The small number will be secrets that new basis for "bad" motives.

and copybooks?

Everyone can be blackmailed (covered, affirmed) if everything "private" was

transparent. Most/Power/ government, corps, in totally transparent? If not individuals: groups?

associates? Church? Union? makes TS?

✓ yes, but (WB, DP) can "embarrass" us with
 oth nations /

✓ but public does need to know (what we) that
 of oth nations, we are supporting — who / what
 we are supporting, why (an empire — not ^{this} terrorism
 see Ali, Mulbani
 David
Shah — Carte

✓ yes, experts lie abroad for the country
 + help sent

But how much of this should be sent
 from US experts & public? For how long?

✓ Answer to: Why do they hate us?
 (Criminal, effected lie — "To our frontiers"
 (not women for small
hundreds!)

✓ to prevent terrorism
 from putting our public's attention — to the
government, the choice for the change
 (as well as, to increase our costs (to expire))

9-11, not (any) Prison Number

instead, use "log of cost"
 (Prisoners die, or Prisoners die)
 (how?)

if referred as "attacked on our values,
 and existence"

12-27-12 4.

✓ Blanton

✓ Burr

✓ Edm - fine (was that meant?)

That fine not considered?

✓

Reibel Estern (Rosen)

✓ Kaplan Edell (Tim of Allen)

✓ Salmon of the doves

(McN could have!)

Trid - with limits

✓

Chop. on C-4; ignored of miners

(in dream: say to 2 guys, one playing

✓

in Patric's apartment - couldn't remember
her name (with Patric) - she doesn't
come out (a son, junior at Duke - (N's low school))
- sits with someone in Bureau.

✓ I'm going down (Woodward - to Chesham
Blossfield Hills [to Chesham, Harrow Point^{of}])
but it's NY; he's playing "Super-Go" with himself
on board;

✓ mentions to his old friend: draft ended
in '72 (? check) - "that's fifty years ago -
no, 40!" (as in real life). "A generation -
2 generations - of kids, legs, have grown up not covered
about the draft. Actually, I liked it; no war, officer." ^{of EM, of} now-mixed

12-27-12

5

People coming at lunch; will we get there?

No, we blast over there.

"How? No wings! Are we riding on

air-jits - like boat (hover-craft?)

40 mph 200 ft

Why can't the man? Why can't he?

Other can't rise so high (not crowded - yet)

I say, this is clearly a dream. See -
dreams outside Manhattan - a dream.

Look out in back of house

"Does this bus go to Blomfield Hills?" Yes

I'm in (A. Morgan's - first road - about Ellis -
it closed.

It's rising - I used an umbrella.

"What kind?" "Cheap" I say, "I suppose
you don't have cheap." "Start at \$1,500"

I want to see. It's light yellow &

green, embroidered, with tassels (& lace?)

I say, "Oh, but that's a parasol."

"Worth it?" I tell him, "There will fly out the door."

I saw flying - up to near roof of house, in
A. Morgan's

Care officers getting PTSD in Iraq &
 Afgan? Wounded? Concern to VN)

Scary about abduction; killed; NATO plans
 see know on "man in secret"

gadgets (Bamb)

know on me,

Einste

"Secret" of Bamb from Russians

(Leitars: If can & will do it!

Did not think we had several secrets?

Wounded of U-238 (Hendon)

(Talk to editor at Bloomberg?

and?

Solomon

draw: RAND come to y house — to give award,
 on to fire me

(I have noticed how few houses I've
 come in — "I want it home" (I'm going to
 show part of manuscript — padded)

Then I think — Wait — I gave up my ID card at
 RAND — I'm not working there — and I want
 pretty point — first using it as officer (too far to
 go) — but don't me — no clearance. Yet I was

and thereby

achieve

likely - to avoid detection - must be done

secretly - unobtrusively - requires cryptography?

Dec 9 - 92

(dried)

- old length

- evolution:

ice bones as
animals

Dec-9, 72

denial of

- Christ Church
- one water / danger
(affairs one
very under-served!

like 1954 Brown
Wob

atmos. testing

(air; water; oxygen;
dist. of infrastructure
family! disorder;

[experiments? EQOP?
and others

Black & CR US & for
Cover & actions, un-
known to public: "un-
Distinguished: Mohr

1) COVERT (Chapman) F.A. 34th
became, things
legit, the supposed
on surprise: or "them"
(many description)
manorance [SURVEILLANCE]

2) Can't identify
because the
are illegitimate wars:
crimes, unlawful, UNCOAT,
despotic, but an public
unless: COVERT FROM
"US"

Mont ^{to} wants some
day ^{OUTLIVED} authored the
prints for keeping the
mont, if there was
any print.

Mont very
just. many - in a
drawing.

Mont wants are
withheld decoy
longer than could be
justified - if there was
any a reason (original)
(CER)

matter for Congressional
oversight & accountability 02-12-12

CYA - avoid blame,
challenge to leadership,
shame or reality,
challenge to prestige,
jobs...

avoid embarrassment
(= avoid blame)

CYA is the L-R
and is not obviously
a potential embarrassment
(anybody could see it)
(come for report for
Ambler (Mills) knowledge